| 1 | JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) United States Attorney | | |
|--------|---|----------------------------|--|
| 3 | BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division | | |
| 4 | OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104) Assistant United States Attorneys | | |
| 6 | 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7241 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 owen.martikan@usdoj.gov | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 9 | Attorneys for Plaintiff | | |
| 10 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 11 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 12 | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | | |
| 13 | | N | |
| 14 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) |) No.: CR 08-0489 JSW | |
| 15 | Plaintiff, | STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] | |
| 16 | v.) | ORDER EXCLUDING TIME | |
| 17 | NORMAN RAE, | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | Defendant. | · | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | On July 29, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status conference. | | |
| 22 | The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial | | |
| 23 | Act calculations from July 29, 2008, through September 4, 2008, for effective preparation of | | |
| 24 | defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time | | |
| 25 | necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due | | |
| 26 | diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice | | |

served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR08-0489 JSW

28

| 1 | defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). | |
|----------|---|--|
| 2 | SO STIPULATED: | |
| 3 | DATED: 8/4/08 JOSEPH R RUSSONIELLO | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | OWEN P. MARTIKAN | |
| 6 | Attorneys for the United States | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | DATED: 8/4/08 BARRY J. PORTMAN | |
| 9 | Mausen Lo SA | |
| 10 11 | STEVEN KALAR Attorneys for Defendant | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | [PROPOSED] ORDER | |
| 14 | As the Court found on July 29, 2008, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of time | |
| 15 | from July 29, 2008, through September 4, 2008, is warranted because the ends of justice served | |
| 16 | by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. | |
| 17 | See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny | |
| 18 | defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the | |
| 19 | exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. | |
| 20 | §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | SO ORDERED. | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | DATED: | |
| 25 | HON. MARIA-ELENA JAMES | |
| 26 | United States Magistrate Judge | |
| 27 | · | |
| 28 | | |

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR08-0489 JSW